Chapter 1

Weaving Spaces and (De)constructing Ways for Multilingual Schools: The Actual and the Imagined

OFELIA GARCÍA, TOVE SKUTNABB-KANGAS and E. MARÍA TORRES-GUZMÁN

To imagine is to begin the process that transforms reality.
bell books, 1990: 9

If we’re seriously interested in education for freedom as well as for the opening of cognitive perspectives, it is also important to find a way of developing a praxis of educational consequence that opens the spaces necessary for the remaking of a democratic community. For this to happen there must of course be a new commitment to intelligence, a new fidelity in communication, a new regard to imagination. It would mean the grant of audibility to numerous voices seldom heard before and, at once, an involvement with all sorts of young people being provoked to make their own the multilinguality needed for structuring of contemporary experience and thematizing lived worlds.
Maxine Greene, 1988: 127

Introduction

The United Nation’s 2004 Human Development Report links cultural liberty to language rights and human development (http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/) and argues that there is

... no more powerful means of ‘encouraging’ individuals to assimilate to a dominant culture than having the economic, social and political returns stacked against their mother tongue. Such assimilation is not freely chosen if the choice is between one’s mother tongue and one’s future. (UNDP, 2004: 33)

The press release about the UN report (see web address above) exemplifies the role of language as an exclusionary tool:

Limitation on people’s ability to use their native language – and limited facility in speaking the dominant or official national language – can exclude people from education, political life and access to justice. Sub-Saharan Africa has more than 2500 languages, but the ability of many
Section 1: Summaries

Part 2: Pedagogies, Values and Schools

Chapter 2: Identity Texts: The Imaginative Construction of Self Through Multiliteracies Pedagogy (Jim Cummins)

The chapter highlights the centrality of the interpersonal space (or zone of proximal development) created in the interactions that teachers orchestrate with their students. Optimal academic development within this interper-
These bold education practices wedge open spaces of possibility, creating new arenas in which to reimagine multilingual schools.

Chapter 5: Attitudes Towards Language Learning in Different Linguistic Models of the Basque Autonomous Community (Feli Etxeberria-Sagashume)

This chapter focuses on the language learning attitudes and motivations of the first student cohort to graduate from high school in one of three linguistic models (A, B, and D) under the 1983 Spanish bilingual law within the Basque Autonomous Community. The qualitative analysis of students' written responses to open-ended questions shows that students are positively disposed to language learning, and variations in attitudes are associated with different languages being learned (Euskara, Spanish, and English) and the linguistic school models they attend. It is concluded that in imagining multilingual schooling, researchers must account for the role of values associated with language learning and the social contexts.

Part 3: Extending Formal Instructional Spaces

Chapter 6: Back to Basics: Marketing the Benefits of Bilingualism to Parents (Viv Edwards and Lynda Hitchcock Newcombe)

This chapter examines the role of parents in language transmission and argues that the ultimate success of any attempt to imagine multilingual schools depends on the extent to which advocates of bilingual education are able to communicate their case to families. Using the example of TESOL, a highly innovative project that promotes the benefits of bilingualism to parents and prospective parents in Wales, the chapter explores the ways in which modern marketing strategies can be used to challenge myths about bilingualism. While recognizing that the linguistic issues vary from one setting to another, it proposes that the central marketing messages of TESOL—that bilingualism is something that parents should aspire to for their children, that the ability to speak another language increases children's life chances and makes the family proud—are ones that are likely to resonate not only in Wales but in a wide range of other settings.

Chapter 7: Popular Education and Language Rights in Indigenous Mayan Communities: Emergence of New Social Actors and Gendered Voices (Karen Ogundick)

Formal public education for indigenous children consists primarily of passive learning from authoritarian teachers who transmit cultural and linguistic values that are markedly distinct from those of the communities in which they are teaching. Within this system, children are taught to reproduce the cultural capital of the dominant class, thus complying with their own subjugation. Many obstacles face indigenous people in realizing a free, public education that respects and promotes their rich linguistic diversity and cultural heritages. Nonetheless, the perseverance and deeply-held belief in the right to learn and maintain one's native language, or batik (literally, 'true language' in Tzotzil) is keeping the dream of multilingual education alive, and indeed making it a reality for many children and adults in Chiapas, Mexico, where one-third of the population is indigenous and 11 indigenous languages are spoken, many of which are endangered.

Beginning with the historical and sociopolitical context of indigenous language rights and bilingual education in Mexico, this chapter describes two main models through which the indigenous people of Chiapas have organized their resistance to the forced acculturation process in public schools for indigenous peoples. One of these models is the autonomous school movement created by the Zapotitlás. Another is the popular education programs of two Chiapas-based Mayan non-governmental organizations—Sna Jts’i’bajom (House of the Writer) and Fortalecida de la Mujer Maya (Empowering Mayan Women). This chapter demonstrates how these grassroots organizations are succeeding in reviving and promoting the native languages for the indigenous people in Chiapas. In addition, with the support of national and international organizations, the work of these grassroots organizations is influencing national language policies in Mexico, and inspiring people across the Mexican borders to promote similar movements for social justice and linguistic human rights in their own communities.

Part 4: Tensions between Multiple Realities

Chapter 8: Imagined Multilingual Schools: How Come We Don't Deliver? (Elana Shohamy)

The chapter begins by portraying the 'imagined multilingual schools' where it is legitimate to use and develop multilingual languages, fusions and hybrids, even beyond languages and towards multimodalities, and where languages are used in free and creative ways beyond monolingual boundaries, purity and correctness. By identifying specific mechanisms that prevent the fantasies from becoming realities, the chapter then proceeds to describe reasons why such goals remain fantasies. Specifically, it claims that it is through a number of powerful mechanisms, used to promote ideologies of nation states, that monolingualism and standards for language correctness continue to be perpetuated. Presenting empirical data on academic achievements of immigrants in schools, as well as appropriate test modifications, the chapter argues that different language policies, language educational policies and especially high-stakes language testing policies (e.g., the No Child Left Behind Act in the US) mean that the messages that are delivered and perpetuated are those of de-legitimation and suppres-
sion of other languages, and promotion and perpetuation of criteria based on 'native' varieties and language correctness. The chapter also identifies other mechanisms, such as language in the public space, language myths and propaganda. It is by examining the mechanisms that operate behind de facto language policies that we can reach some understanding of why 'we don't deliver'. The author calls for increasing understanding of these issues through language awareness and activism.

Chapter 9: Monolingual Assessment and Emerging Bilinguals: A Case Study in the US (Kathy Escamilla)

This chapter presents a case study examining the implementation of large-scale programs for testing emerging bilingual students. US schools have become increasingly diverse linguistically. However, assessment systems to determine student academic achievement have become more monolingual in their focus. Second language learners are frequently blamed for any perceived under-performance on these exams. In a few states, including Colorado, Spanish/English emerging bilinguals are allowed to take assessments in Spanish. Data collected in this case study compared academic achievement in reading and writing between students who took the Colorado CSAP test in Spanish and English. Findings indicated that students taking the assessments in Spanish outperformed students taking the CSAP in English, and in the schools studied, Spanish outcomes exceeded district-wide English averages. Findings support the need to assess emerging bilinguals in both their languages.

Chapter 10: The Long Road to Multilingual Schools in Botswana (Lydia Nyati-Ramahobo)

At independence, the government of Botswana imagined a monolingual society in which English would be the only language of education, the judiciary, and all other social domains. The government also imagined that Setswana would be the only language used in national life when dealing with the general population. The language-in-education policy and related legal instruments were put in place to create an ordinary citizen who is monolingual in Setswana and an educated one who is bilingual in Setswana and English.

In contrast to this view, the situation on the ground was that 99% of the population spoke one of the 26 unrecognized languages (Walter & Ringenberg, 1994). This population imagined a multilingual society and multilingual schools, thus creating a backlash between the Tsawana political leaders and the numerical majority non-Tsawana. This chapter describes government efforts in creating monolingualism and societal movements that countered this position and developed multilingualism and multiculturalism. Esha 6 Primary School serves as an example of a school envi-
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Part 5: Negotiating Policies of Implementation

Chapter 11: Nichols to NCLB: Local and Global Perspectives on US Language Education Policy (Nancy Hornberger)

In the anniversary year of landmark US Supreme Court decisions affirming the right to equal educational opportunity for all children irrespective of race or language origin, it behooves us to take a look at how well we are fulfilling the mandates of Brown v. Board of Education (1954) and Lau v. Nichols (1974). In an attempt to understand both what is happening and what could happen to promote and build on the multilingual resources present in US schools, this chapter takes a historical and comparative look at US language education policy at the federal level since 1974 and draws on ethnographic work locally in one urban school district and globally in multilingual contexts.

Chapter 12: Cultural Diversity, Multilingualism, and Indigenous Education in Latin America (Luis Enrique López)

This chapter re-evaluates some underlying principles of intercultural bilingual education (IBE) in Latin America, based on a brief overview of the sociocultural contexts in which this type of education is implemented. Emphasis is placed on the cases of Bolivia and Guatemala, countries where indigenous peoples constitute a real national majority. Although intercultural bilingual education has evolved as a recognized national model, attention is paid to the emergence of recent alternative proposals, which according to their authors-indigenous leaders and organizations-are a search for even more cultural pertinence. The discrepancy results from the low importance given to indigenous knowledge in school curricula.

Thus, the new proposals of educación propia (own education) or endogenous education, in spite of its denomination, also includes interculturalism and multilingualism under indigenous control and management. In the midst of such discrepancies, intercultural bilingual education is periodically reinvented through bottom-up indigenous proposals.

Chapter 13: Multilingualism of the Unequalities: Predicaments of Education in India: Mother Tongue or Other Tongue? (Ajit K. Mohanty)

Analysis of the nature of Indian multilingualism shows that, despite the strong maintenance norms, the hegemonic role of English gives rise to a socially legitimated and transmitted hierarchical pecking order in which mother tongues are gradually marginalized and pushed into domains of lesser power and resource in what can be characterized as a self-defensive anti-predatory strategy. Caught in the process of unequal power relation-
slip between languages and lacking a clear multilingual framework, education in India is unable to balance the demands of the societal multilingualism and the dominant status of English.

The place of languages in Indian education and the various nominal forms of multilingual education are analyzed to show the cost of neglecting the mother tongues and tribal languages in education. Some studies interrogating the myth of English medium superiority and showing the benefits of mother-tongue-based multilingual education are discussed. It is argued that education must cater to the social needs of every child to develop from mother tongue to multilingualism and provide equality of opportunity through a language-shelter type of multilingual education that begins in mother-tongue medium and introduces other languages after at least three to five years of primary schooling.

Section 2: Positioning as Researchers on Multilingual Schools and Questioning of Issues

Our multivision positioning as researchers: What is and what ought to be, the actual and the imagined

Homi Bhabha (1990; 1994) and Walter Mignolo (2000) have emphasized that the place of enunciation makes a difference in our construction of knowledge. Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), Bhabha (1994) and Edward Said (1993) remind us of one of the resources of immigrants, exiles, refugees, and other "transnational"; namely, their/our ability to have "double vision" or to "be in the middle", so as to be able to have a critical orientation towards the many places in which they/we have lived.

If this is so, then those of us whose life experience is often not schools — has made us bilingual or multilingual also have multiple ways of using our languages to voice an alternative worldview and a critical perspective. We have multiple associations, voices and voices, developed through our ability to be in the middle.

Many of the authors in the volume describe educational and language-related struggles of marginalized indigenous peoples or minorities and challenges they/we face. Many do it both from the inside and from the outside. Is this biased or less than "objective"? All views, in fact, are subjective. The dominant views, which are unmarked and appear as non-biased, correspond to the dominant special interest, while at the same time enjoying the privilege of appearing as "objective". Thus, standpoint theorists criticize the claims of objectivism that insist that the only alternative to a "view from nowhere" (a positivistic "objective" view posing as neutral) is a special interest bias — which leads to value relativism (Skotnes-Kangas, 2000: XXX-XX). In contrast, according to Sandra Harding (1988: 159), "standpoint epistemologies propose that institutionalized power imbal-

ances give the act of starting off from marginalized lives a critical edge for formulating new questions that can expand everyone's knowledge about institutionalized power and its effects".

The age-old debate about the role of researchers is whether we should state only what is, or also suggest and study what ought to be. As editors of this book, we hope that the text invites readers to build on what Myles Horton (founder of the earliest Center for Civil Rights work in the US) has called "a divided vision". In The Long Haul (1997), Horton explains that during his work with Martin Luther King Jr and others, he kept a divided vision — one eye on where people were at the time, and one eye on where he thought it was possible for them to go. Maxine Greene (2000) holds that the role of all educators, namely to enable transformation, is about the interaction of the actual and the imagined. Transformation is about staying in touch with the world as it is, while calling for the possibility of naming alternatives to the given. Transformation is also about bringing the virtual into existence by going beyond ordinarily accepted limits. With these multivisions and multilingual voices, our texts support people and peoples who struggle for societal equity, and want multilingual educational programs as a building block on the way to social justice. We situate our vision in the hope of possibilities and of creating spaces for dreams to come forth, and in the hope of making the struggle of indigenous and minority peoples to achieve equity through an appropriate education, a reality. Thus, we engage with polemical activists (Crawford, 1999; Nagengast & Vélez-Ibáñez, 2004) and assume the standpoint of what DuBois called the "two-ness" or double consciousness (cited in Aldrige, 2003). Upholding the right to multilingualism, we denounce the mechanisms through which societal and school oppress less powerful groups into shame and silence.

Our positions on education and schools as control agents

This book recognizes that education is not solely about formal schools. Education is social action, and all families, peers and other social groupings attempt to transform themselves and their "consciences" through everyday teaching and learning (Vareme, forthcoming). As social action, education occurs in informal contexts, outside of school. The chapter by Edwards and Pritchard Newcombe on the educational efforts with health professionals on behalf of the bilingualism of Welsh children is an example of an effort to create a supportive out-of-school educational context that impacts families, children, educators, and schools.

Other out-of-school examples are alternative educational programs for adults who have been failed by state schools and remain formally "uneducated". The latter is the case of the popular education programs in Latin America described by both Ogulnick and López in this volume. Out-of-
school programs could be important vehicles for alternative certification, for the labor market, and for the individual and society in general. Sometimes ethno-linguistic groups are able to create and develop parallel educational sites that build on their own language and literacy practices. When these groups have sufficient financial resources and political clout, these alternative educational sites function alongside the established state schools, and provide a true alternative to the education state-schools provide. That is the case of many of the programs for indigenous education described by McCarty, Romero, and Zepeda in this volume.

One could imagine that bringing such programs permanently into the folds of the formal education system, as Etxeberria reports to be the case with Model D in the Basque Country, could result in mutual gain and benefits. Easier state financing might be one of the benefits for the programs. On the other hand, becoming part of the formal state system might also suffocate some of the freedom and flexibility these educational programs enjoy as alternatives. Schools, and especially state schools, are subjected to external control—educational state agencies that, under the pretense of supporting accountability, prescribe top-down curricula, books, testing, and even language of instruction and assessment. Escamilla, Hornberger, McCarty et al., and Shohamy, among others, in this volume, discuss this control.

In some states, education systems are very centralized and hierarchical. This is the case, for example, with the French system described by Hélot and Young, where decisions are taken at ministerial level in Paris and circulated down to teachers through a monthly official bulletin. Some other education systems are more decentralized, with more control by local educational authorities. This is the case with the Finnish system. In the international comparisons in the PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) of the OECD studies (http://www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,2987,en_327935_51_3225731_1_1_1_1,100.html), Finnish come out as the best readers in the world. The Finnish National Board of Education mentions on its website, in addition to several other factors, ‘Supportive and flexible administration—centralised steering of the whole, local implementation’ as one of the reasons for the success.4

But, regardless of more or less flexibility, all state schools participate in functioning as agents of imagined nationhood (in Benedict Anderson’s sense, 1983). This often promotes the semblance, or the idealized image of, one identity, one culture, and one standard language and literacy—even though these realities are much more complex—to which the individual partially attaches his/her sense of identity. Some of the chapters in this book uncover some of the dominant hidden curricula of schools, and especially the role they have played in suppressing the diversity of language and literacy practices of children and youth—the most vulnerable in society.

Weaving Spaces and (De)constructing Ways for Multilingual Schools

The chapters in this volume go beyond describing parallel educational programs and uncovering or deconstructing the dominant hidden curricula. Even under oppressive regimes and conditions, human beings find ways of engaging in resistance, what Yarene (forthcoming) calls ‘centrifugal, hidden and playful activity’ that has the potential to transform their conditions, even if the educational activity itself is hidden. For example, within the United States, enslaved African Americans taught each other to read, even when their literacy was forbidden (Gundaker, forthcoming). Even in highly structured state schools, there is much centrifugal, hidden and playful activity that has the power to imagine and create new possibilities that transform the monolithic and monologic vision of these schools.

Building on the power of imagination and resilience, some of the chapters in this volume (for example, Cummins, Hélot and Young, McCarty et al.) identify practices and pedagogies that have the potential of resistance and transformation. Many of the pedagogies in the chapters build on indigenous and minority social and cultural contexts that are usually not thought of, are not acknowledged, or are prohibited within the hidden curricula in public schools organized by dominant groups (Ada, 1995; Trujillo, 1999). These alternative pedagogies proposed within this volume acknowledge that there are multiple ways of knowing and doing which are essential to fully educate indigenous and immigrant or autochthonous minority children.

Our positions on multilingual education and its complexity

We have often seen terms such as multicultural or intercultural education celebrated and used in ways that exclude multilingualism. We have also observed schools claim that they practice multilingual education when they, at the most, teach a few languages as subjects. Often this teaching has been outside ordinary school hours, organized by parents or some minority organization that they are not recognized or paid for by parents, embassies or the like, not the school. We do not want to water down the concept of multilingual education.

We adhere to Anderson’s (1978) classic definition of bilingual education as one in which two languages are used as languages of instruction in subjects other than the languages themselves. This means that the main criterion for multilingual education is the number of languages of instruction. Accordingly, multilingual education is education where more than two languages are used as languages of instruction in subjects other than the languages themselves.

It is manifestly not enough for a school that wants to offer multilingual education to be ‘linguistically diverse’ (i.e., to have students with many mother tongues) or to have a population that is linguistically different from a country’s dominant majority (where this exists, as it does in most European countries and in North America, but not in many African or even Asian countries, which may not have any decided ‘majorities’). It is
not enough to have multilingual staff, or a situation where many languages are heard in the corridors or seen on the walls. All of this is positive, and necessary, but it is not sufficient for designing a program as multilingual education.

We adopt in this book the term ‘multilingual school’ to mean schools, which exert educational effort that takes into account and builds further on the diversity of languages and literacy practices that children and youth bring to school. This means going beyond ‘acceptance’ or ‘tolerance,’ to cultivating of children’s diverse languages and culture resources and includes using the children’s languages (whether dominant, indigenous, or immigrant or autochthonous minority) as teaching languages. This educational effort can be very different, depending on social, historical, political, economic and linguistic factors, and thus there are many ways of being a ‘multilingual school.’ A necessary ingredient, though, is using several teaching languages.

One of the challenges we have had in writing this Introduction stems from the richness of this variety in educational provision and, especially, from understanding the complexity of how far whose imagination can stretch in which sociopolitical and sociolinguistic contexts and in which country. On a global scale, what seems like an unrealistic dream for some countries and educators already takes place in other contexts; likewise, for some of us, what actually is happening in some other places seems like a nightmare. What follows are some examples.

Starting with small dominant groups, Icelandic-speakers in Iceland, we find that 94% of the population of 296,000 people (see Appendix, Table 1.3) have all their education, from day-care to kindergarten to school to university, through the medium of Icelandic. The whole society functions in Icelandic, a language with a written tradition stretching over a thousand years. Icelanders are very proud of their language, aware of its structure and vocabulary, interested in its planting; and it is self-evident for them that they can do everything in Icelandic. Despite few natural resources except fish, Iceland has one of the highest living standards in the world. In South Africa, however, the numerically largest group (over 10 million) is the Zulu. 23.8% of the population of some 44 million (see Appendix, Table 1.3). Despite being numerically 33 times the number of Icelanders, many Zulus say that their language is so small that it is impossible to develop higher education in Zulu, or to use it in most advanced formal functions. Note that Zulu is easily among the 100 largest languages out of the 6,912 languages in the world identified in the 15th edition of the Ethnologue (2005). Many Zulu children undergo subtractive English-medium education, which does not support high levels of multilingualism. Very few of them learn Zulu at a high formal level, or learn other African languages in school. Thus, ‘small’ and ‘big’ are not only functions of power relations, they are also functions of the eyes of the imaginer.

The terms immersion, submersion, transition, maintenance or revitalization—terms traditionally used to describe different kinds of bilingual education programs and approaches—are also terms that shift depending on whether one is speaking about the program itself or the power relationships of the language(s) of instruction in relation to the student. For example, to be “immersed” into a language not your own, you need to be a power majority (such as an English-speaker in Canada taught through the medium of French, a Finnish-speaker in Finland taught through the medium of Swedish or an English-speaker in the US taught through the medium of Spanish in an immersion or two-way program). Alternatively, if you are not a power majority (in the way that the Zulus, for example, are not, despite their numerical strength), being taught through the medium of your dominant language is submersion—unless this language happens to be that of your ancestors’, your grandparents’ or parents’ revitalizing language, as is the case in most Hawaiian, Māori, Ojibway, Navajo or Aníbal Sami immersion programs. A concept interpretation that does not take into account the sociopolitical circumstances of groups can turn a dream into a nightmare and vice versa.

Some indigenous peoples do have ‘dream’ schools in which their own languages are used as the main media of education at least up to upper secondary education; some can also study a few subjects (at least their own language and culture, sometimes more) in their L1 at university level. This is true for some Māori children in Aotearoa/New Zealand (some 319,000 people, 7.9% of the population of around 4 million) and some North Saami in Norway and Finland (see Appendix, Table 1.3 for figures; there are altogether 10 Saami languages; the number of Saami is between 60,000 and 100,000, maybe half of whom speak Sami languages; see http://www.galdj.org/english/dje.php?sladja=25&volltsladja=11; for the uncertainty of figures, see also Magga & Skutnabb-Kangas, 2003 and Aikio-Puuskkari & Pentikäinen, 2001). All Saami children become minimally trilingual.

Bodo ‘tribal’ children in India have also, after a long struggle, managed to get mother-tongue-medium education in Assam, and Bodo is now one of the 22 official languages in India. Bodo children in mother-tongue-medium education are doing as well as Assamese children in Assamese-medium education and much better than Bodo children in Assamese-medium education (see, Sakia & Mohanty, 2004). Eight other tribal group children in Andra Pradesh, India, have also started education through the medium of their own languages in 2005 (Rao, 2005).

Quotes from various studies in Ian Martin’s reports (Martin, 2000a, 2000b) for the Nunavut government in Canada also characterize Inuit children, taught completely through the medium of English, in ways that
articulate the disaster or nightmare that indigenous children face in the world as a result of the imposition of dominant languages. The report Komisi Khoisan Perspective or Bilingual Education (by Katherine Zoela and Simon Ford, 1985) tells of Canadian Inuit students who are 'neither fluent nor literate in either language,' and presents statistics showing that students 'end up at only Grade 4 level of achievement after 9 years of schooling.' The Canadian Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples 1996 Report notes that 'submersion strategies which neither respect the child's first language nor help them gain fluency in the second language may result in impaired fluency in both languages.' The Nunavut Language Policy Conference in March 1998 claims that 'in some individuals, neither language is firmly anchored'. The report Kitikmeot struggles to prevent death of Inuitth (1998) tells of 'teenagers [who] cannot converse fluently with their grandparents'.

In an interview in PFI's (United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues) Quarterly Newsletter Message Stick 3:2 (http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/umfii/news/news_2.htm), PFI's first chair, Professor Ole Henrik Magga, sums up the connections between the concepts of human rights, language, language policy, and education in his view, education is one of the three most important challenges for the world's indigenous peoples in the years to come (the other two are land and health issues). He sees linguistic human rights in education as a necessary prerequisite for the maintenance of indigenous languages and traditional knowledges, and demands much more work on languages and an end to the killing of languages 'caused by the educational systems in today's nationalist education for indigenous peoples.' Lopez (Chapter 12) makes the same case for the education of indigenous peoples in Latin America, showing how they fall behind in school precisely because of the lack of an education that acknowledges the need for the indigenous mother tongues.

The education of an autochthonous minority like the Swedish speakers in Finland (some 5.7% of the population, under 300,000 people) also represents a dream for many. In this case all education, up to and including university, takes place in Swedish, and Swedish-speakers see Swedish as a medium of instruction and the value of their language as self-evident. Of course they learn the majority language, Finnish, in school, and those who also use it outside school, develop very high (often native-like) proficiency. In addition, one, two, or even three other languages can be studied as subjects in school. Few Swedish-speaking parents fear that the children might not learn Finnish and English well in their Swedish-medium school — and results show that there is no reason to fear. All Finnish-speaking children also study Swedish in school as a subject, and many are in Swedish-medium immersion programs (see www.usassa.fi/hun/svenska/eside1.htm). French-speakers in Quebec in Canada, have a similar position. For most African autochthonous minorities (much smaller in numbers than the Zulu, also in terms of percentages of the total population), the educational situation is a submersion and assimilationist nightmare, with results that remind us of the Inuit quotes about education above. Even here, both politicians and researchers/authors know well what should be done instead (see, for example, www.outreach.psu.edu/C&L/Alldays/declaration.html for the Asmara Declaration on African Languages and Literatures).

The immigrant minority children have good additive bilingual education. Nonetheless, there are examples of effective bilingualism and multilingualism in the education of immigrant minority children. One example would be Spanish-speaking children in the United States in some two-way programs (if these last long enough — see Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Thomas & Colette, 2002; Freeman et al., 2005), or in more traditional bilingual education programs, such as Late Exit bilingual transitional education programs (Villarreal, 1999). Another example would be Finnish speakers in Sweden who are in one of the eight private Finnish-medium schools and get excellent results.

An example of a nightmarish educational situation for immigrants would be that of Denmark, as this country has the harshest assimilation policy in Europe. There are no mother-tongue-medium schools and next to no mother-tongue teaching as a subject, and the (only) important educational goal for immigrant children is the learning of Danish. The type of education described by Cummins in this volume (Chapter 2), for instance, would be a dream — it does not exist. Minority children's Danish is supposed to be tested from the age of three, and if they do not perform well, severe measures follow: At least half of these children leave school as so-called 'functional illiterates,' and fairly few get any further education after grade 9. In Denmark, immigrant minority youth is grossly overrepresented in criminality statistics. Sixty percent of the inmates in closed institutions for criminal youngsters have immigrant background (July 2005 figures). It is a basic economic issue — prevention may cost less than punishment. One place in these 'correctional' facilities costs the taxpayers (including, of course, immigrant minority taxpayers — even it immigrant minorities' unemployment figures are for many groups three times those of the Danes) 1.8 million Danish crowns, a bit under 250,000 Euros (around 300,000 US dollars) per year. With the cost of maintaining a young person in one of these institutions for one year, he (most are males) could have had a private bilingual teacher, through the medium of the mother tongue, during the whole nine years of comprehensive school.

Bilingual education also exists for other types of children who are not immigrant, autochthonous minorities or indigenous. The twelve European (Union) Schools, with over 16,000 students are a positive example (see Baetsens, Beets, 1995; www.eu.org/SE/html/en/InExen_home.html). These European (Union) Schools have subsections where each
language is used as the main medium of education for many years, and the children learn at least two other languages, one of them at a near-native level. Many elite schools of this type exist in several countries; some international schools may also partially belong here. at least with respect to some of their students, even though for many students these schooling experiences represent submersion (see Carver, forthcoming). The shift in meanings with respect to who is experiencing the teaching language(s) does not preclude from recognizing the ways of characterizing and categorizing multilingual schools.

We believe that William Mackey’s old typology (1972) is still one of, if not the most elaborated one, and is perfectly valid even today. He uses four main dimensions, each with many subcategories:

1. the relationship between the language(s) of the home and the schools;
2. curriculum;
3. the linguistic character of the immediate environment as compared with the wider national environment;
4. the function, status and differences between the languages.

Those within the first two dimensions seem to loom large in the present text. In the first one, Mackey distinguishes between learners from unilingual and bilingual homes, with the home language (one or both) used or not used as school language. The curriculum dimension distinguishes between:

1. medium of instruction (single or dual medium);
2. pattern of development (maintenance of two or more languages or transfer from one medium of instruction to another);
3. distribution of the languages (different or equal and the same);
4. direction (towards assimilation/acculturation into a dominant culture or towards integration into a resurgent one, i.e. irredentism – or self-determination, as we might call it today);
5. complete or gradual change from one medium to another.


Most of the dimensions, which in several typologies are presented as opposites, are in fact continua, and all the developers of the typologies are aware of that. If we see most of Mackey’s categories as continua (similar to Hornberger’s continua of bilingualism, see Hornberger, 2002) rather than as discreet either/or points, most of the educational experience described in this book can in fact be placed within this over-30-year-old typology. Certainly some of the emphases today are different from 30 years ago, and more details are known about various situations around the world. But, despite all the changes that have come with corporate globalization, voluntary and enforced mobility, and global media access for some, the complexities, dynamisms, and hybridizations of multilingualism have been in existence, albeit not recognized or named, for a long time. To us, this emphasizes the fact that we know more than enough about how much education should NOT be organized, and a great deal about how it could be organized under different circumstances to yield positive results. The main problem is not our lack of knowledge or shallow understanding of the old and new complexities. The problem is that the knowledge is not being acknowledged, not used or implemented widely. Nyati-Ramahobo in this volume says, for instance, when speaking about the development of multilingual schools in Botswana, that there is a social choice, and that the major impediment is lack of political will.

Many indigenous peoples have known for a long time the genocidal consequences of the nightmarish, subtractive dominant-language-medium education. For example, ‘The Code of Handsome Lake’ (The Good Message), developed by Handsome Lake, a Seneca born in 1735, and contained in Chief Jacob Thomas’s Teachings from the Longhouse (1994), describes the consequences of transferring their children to the ‘white race’. The Code was meant to strengthen and unify the Iroquoian community ‘against the effects of white society’. Handsome Lake says:

We feel that the white race will take away the culture, traditions, and language of the red race. When your people’s children become educated in the way of white people, they will no longer speak their own language and will not understand their own culture. Your people will suffer great misery and not be able to understand their elders anymore. We feel that when they become educated, not a single child will come back and stand at your side because they will no longer speak your language or have any knowledge of their culture. (Handsome Lake, quoted in Thomas, 2001/1994: 41-42)

Likewise, the results of additive teaching through the medium of the mother tongue (even if it is transitional) have been known for a long time. The USA Board of Indian Commissioners (here quoted from Francis and Reyhner) wrote in 1880:

First teaching the children to read and write in their own language enables them to master English with more ease when they take up that study... A child beginning a four year course with the study of Dakota would be further advanced in English at the end of the term than one
who had not been instructed in Dakota (page 77) ... It is true that by beginning in the Indian tongue and then putting the students into English studies, our missionaries say that after three or four years their English is better than it would have been if they had begun entirely with English (page 98). (Francis & Reytnier. 2002: 45-46)

What all of this means is that multilingualism in education can be studied only from an ecological perspective centered on the dynamic and changing conditions of the complex historical, ideological, structural, and practical contexts in which people use different languages and different varieties of languages in society and schools. Multilingual practices are enmeshed within, and influenced by, social, historical, political, economic, and linguistic factors (Nieto. 2001). To design spaces and both deconstruct and then construct ways for multilingual schools requires a situated view of languages and their speakers and identities, and attention to these different conditions. But especially it requires attention to the power relations that maintain negative educational models, as well as the ensuing unequal social and political relations which represent linguicism; that is:

Jyderlogies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, regulate and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and immaterial) between groups which are defined on the basis of language (on the basis of their mother tongues). (Skutnabb-Kangas. 1988: 13)

This ecological view of languages in education recognizes that the threads of the multiple enmeshed continua are not independent of each other or of other factors. They are often tangled and intertwined.

Section 3: Important Questions and Issues for Reflection

Before we present, based on an ecological view of languages in education, some of the threads in this book, we want to introduce some of the important issues that are discussed and debated, often with strong emotional arguments, in many countries, including in this text—the segregation of minorities, the separation of languages, the need for bilingual teachers, the privileging of minority languages, and the need (or otherwise) for standardization. Questions emerging from these issues have to do with the types of reflection discussed below:

Question 1: To what extent is it necessary, beneficial and ethically acceptable to separate minority students into their own, linguistically homogenous groups, for some or all of the education?

Social reactions to old apartheid and other segregationist education experiences often seem to prevent people from seeing that it is not an issue of segregating or excluding anyone permanently. But at least initial physical segregation of minority students may be pedagogically necessary for them to be taught cognitively challenging material and learn their own language at a high level (for an example, see Garcia & Bartlett, forthcoming). Students need to start from their own level of proficiency, in order for instruction to be organized most effectively.

Claiming that one wants the children to maintain their language and develop it further sounds hollow if the school system is not prepared to organize education that makes this possible. Unless the non-dominant language is used as the main medium of education for a number of years, competence is it necessarily remains shallow. Often many of the measures taken by schools are therapeutic, more social psychological ‘feel good’, ‘proud of their heritage’, ‘enhance their self-confidence’ type, rather than beneficial linguistically and educationally. A wish to ‘integrate’ minority students physically as early as possible with dominant group students overrides educational and linguistic concerns in most cases, particularly when teachers are not prepared linguistically and educationally to deal with the added complexity of a linguistically heterogeneous student group. (Howard & Loeb. 1998). This results in the violation of children’s educational and linguistic human rights (Magga et al., 2005; Duskar et al., forthcoming). It has been pointed out, for example, that despite the good intentions of some two-way dual language education programs in the United States, language minority students’ linguistic and educational needs are often ignored (for more on this, see Garcia, 2006; Valdés, 1997). The reason, of course, is that the political agenda of states to socially integrate and homogenize is often more important than the educational needs of children.

As Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1995: 77) has put it: ‘State interests thus are still more powerful at the present time than the human rights of peoples’. Amy Tsui’s conclusion is similar:

Medium-of-instruction policies are shaped by an interaction between political, social, and economic forces. However, among these agendas, it is always the political agenda that takes priority. Other agendas, be they social, economic, or educational, come to the fore only if they converge with the political agenda. Yet it is always these agendas that will be used as public justification for policy making. (Tsui. 2004: 113)

Allan Luke, having worked as a Deputy Director General of Education in addition to doing innovative educational research in several countries, states:

The question is only in part about whether and how teachers and schools can change. The prior question is whether governments,
We agree with these authors and believe that, because the education of linguistic minorities has been disastrous to date, policies need to be discussed more broadly and widely, bringing together the social issues of inclusion/exclusion, linguistic equity, and educational experiences and outcomes as they relate to non-dominant language students. These discussions call for a wide distribution of what we know to date about the positive effects and benefits of multilingual education to the individual, to specific social groups, and to society at large.

Question 2: To what extent do the languages need to be fairly strictly separated in the classroom, allocating different functions, times, or spaces to each language?

Should classrooms concentrate on one language at a time, or are they allowed to mirror the realities outside schools where many mix and switch freely? Shohamy in this volume (Chapter 8) reminds us: “[L]anguages and their varieties need to be acquired, used, and developed harmoniously, for nothing else but to reflect the ‘real world’, as schools are meant to prepare students for the ‘real world’.”

Usually the bilingual, trilingual or multilingual programs that separate languages have more prestige than the models that use languages interchangeably and that only use certain aspects of the two languages in education. Elite bilingual education programs tend to always separate languages. This is also the case of the models of ethnolinguistic groups like the Basque in Etxeberria’s chapter, reclaiming their autochthonous languages and using them in education, thus transforming their roles and equalizing their value with that of dominant society. Yet, the transitional bilingual education programs organized for indigenous peoples in Latin America described by López (Chapter 12), for many regional groups in India described by Mohanty (Chapter 15), and for African groups described by Nyati-Ramahobo (Chapter 10), those for immigrant minorities in the United States described by Escamilla (Chapter 8), tend not to separate the languages, at least not strictly. As Nyati-Ramahobo and Mohanty make evident practices in the classroom are often quite multilingual, with the two languages being used simultaneously (Nyati-Ramahobo refers to this as the ‘creeping in’ of other languages and cultures). This may reflect the community language experiences of using more than one language in social interaction (Zentella, 1997; Torres, 1997) or the lack of consistency in language policy implementation at local levels (García, M.E., 2004; Howard et al., 2003; Torres-Guzmán et al., 2005), despite the state’s efforts to impose monolingual schooling or programmatic mandates of separating the languages.

Question 3: To what extent is it necessary to have bilingual or multilingual teachers who know the students’ mother tongue(s)?

This is obviously most important where there are minority children from only one or at the most two linguistic groups in the same classroom (i.e. in transitional or maintenance models for minority students), in immersion models for dominant group students, and in two-way models for both groups (provided that neither group includes any students with other mother tongues than the two that are involved). But it is also important to have multilingual teachers who are knowledgeable of many languages and cultures in linguistically heterogeneous classrooms, such as the ones described by Cummins in Chapter 2 of this volume (see question 4 below).

An argument we often hear is: ‘But I have 14 different mother tongues in my class – how can I possibly know all of them?’ The number of languages in a classroom is not only a question of what kinds of students exist in the catchment area of the school, but it is also a challenge for the organization of schools. If we know that students benefit from linguistically-homogenous classrooms, these can be organized, maybe not for all, but at least for a large number of students, provided the political will exists. The teachers’ bilingual competence is essential in these cases.

More importantly, if one wants bilingual teachers, the question would be whether to invest in linguistic and pedagogical training of many monolingual teachers or to ask the monolingual teachers how far teacher solidarity goes. Are monolingual teachers willing to learn a new language and new pedagogies, or are they willing to offer the jobs to bilingual teachers? The Hague Recommendations Regarding the Education Rights of National Minorities from OSCE’s High Commissioner on National Minorities (http://www.osce.org/documents/html/pdf.html/2700_en.pdf.html) are very clear on this point, as they recommend bilingual teachers for all minority students, including bilingual teachers in the dominant language as a second language. The recommendations, which stand as a standard in international law, are also valid for immigrant minorities, and the USA and Canada are, in addition to most European countries, members of the OSCE.

Worldwide, the issues of teacher preparation and language proficiency of the teachers are critical variables associated with the quality of programs. Often, where teacher preparation programs exist, they suffer from lack of resources (Renson, 2004). The preparation of large numbers of bi/multilingual teachers is critical.
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Question 4: To what extent does the minority language need to be spoken and written by many or all high-status staff in schools?

In schools where two or more languages are used as languages of instruction for several years (as outlined in the question above), high-status staff must be bilingual. But is it enough if the students are "allowed" to use their first languages amongst themselves, during the breaks, or in group work in the classroom, with or without support from parents and their own community (as in Cummins' chapter)? Is it enough that parents and community members are invited to school to present a minority language (as in Helot's chapter)? Is it enough that teachers' aids use it in class? Cummins and Helot and Young describe integrated educational efforts that in some ways build on the students' multilingualism, and we believe this kind of education can certainly change attitudes towards minority languages and make all children (and teachers) more metalinguistically aware. Schools in which the latter practices take place have not traditionally been considered bilingual or multilingual schools. But increasingly today, as more than two languages are included in schools, these kind of practices characterize positive schools.

Many of the successful programs whose results include high levels of both bi- or multilingualism and school achievement, and positive identities (as in the Basque models described by Etxeberria in Chapter 3) go much further than the practices described above in their attempts at privileging the minority language and equalizing the status of the languages involved. Part of these efforts to equalize the status of the languages in schools involves employing high-status staff — principals, administrators, teachers — who are bilingual. Another part of these efforts involves the question of to what extent positive results for minority students include or even depend on linguistic mutuality; that is, dominant language students also learning at least some of the minority language(s).

Question 5: To what extent do the languages involved, especially the minority students' mother tongue, need to be standardized, and also have written literature (as opposed to only oral literature)?

Language revitalization efforts are often, although not always, accompanied by the development of a written language and standardization. Some researchers see standardization as leading to disappearance of many languages (see Mühlhäusler, 1990, 1996) and many programs have showed well despite the lack of a standardized or even written language (see, e.g. McCarty, 2002, 2003, 2005a, 2005b; McCarty & Watorhongie (1999); and articles in McCarty, 2005c). Questions of standardization, and of inventing spaces for literacy in schools where there is no corresponding community need for literacy, as in the case of some of the United States indigenous communities, are extremely complex (for some of these issues see, for example, Hornberger and King, 1999).

Despite the dynamism of, and the variety of issues emerging from multilingualism that are evident in these five questions and in expanded forms within this volume, there are certain threads that pull our chapters together, AND apart — as expressed in the visions in the individual chapters. Many of the threads present paradoxes with tensions that mirror the multiple and/but often contradictory identities and ideologies at an individual level. Hence, in the next part of this Introduction we try, in addition to the questions posed above, to identify some of the threads that already go and might go into the designs of spaces where multilingual education is possible, threads that need both deconstruction and also pulling together.

Section 4: Weaving the Threads: Tangled Threads as Paradoxes in Multilingual Education

James Tollefson and Amy Tsui (2004) summarize some of the key issues in language in education policy:

1. medium-of-instruction policies as ideological and discursive constructs;
2. the gap between (pluralist) discourse and (monolingual) practice;
3. the importance of resources;
4. the relationship between ethno linguistic diversity and social conflict;
5. the potential impact of language rights in education;
6. the tension between global and local concerns.

Most of these issues are also very present in this volume, despite the fact that the case studies Tollefson and Tsui include in their volume have little overlap with the ones here. The issues of language education policy are universal.

We identify and discuss below five threads that present paradoxes and tensions that surround multilingual schools and that are addressed by our contributors:

1. linguistic diversity is more visible today, yet increasingly disappearing;
2. languages are equal, yet language hierarchies prevail;
3. hybridities in multilingual practices and in identities are old, yet awareness of them has increased.
4. tensions between state-imposed homogenization and real-life multilingualism can occasion the closing or carving out of spaces;
5. English, English, everywhere...
Thread 1: Linguistic diversity is more visible, yet increasingly disappearing

We are continuously hearing that the world is increasingly linguistically diverse. Helot and Young (Chapter 3) tell us: 'As in many other countries in the world, the linguistic landscape of France is undeniably becoming more diversified.' Traditionally, with bounded and territorialized languages and less mobility, many people from the East and, especially, the West, did not see, hear, or come into contact with as many languages, and as frequently, as we do now. Because of our technologically-enhanced world, more of us are more aware of the world’s linguistic diversity, as we hear different languages in the media, and see different scripts on the walls and on the web (those of us who are wired, meaning one sixth of the world’s population). The diffusion of the world’s languages, a product of the flow of people, goods, services, ideas, and communications, caused by transnational capitalist exploitation, market societies, and new technologies, has led to the more dynamic and fluid plurilingualism of the present, with people not only speaking a particular language in one territory, but yielding multiple ways of using that language depending on the country and social context in which it is used. Increasingly, the languages of Nigeria, for example, are not just heard in rural villages, spoken by members of one ethnic nation, and often in combination with the languages of neighboring ethnic nations with whom they communicate. Nigerian languages are also heard today in New York City, London, Paris, and other urban centers that attract labor from around the world. Schools in these cities suddenly have to cope with the many languages of Africa that children bring into the classrooms. Many teachers have never heard the names of the languages and some have difficulty even placing the countries of origin of their students on a map. Urbanization in many African, Asian and Latin American countries likewise brings teachers in contact with languages and cultures earlier unknown to them.

These changes have been surprisingly difficult in those parts of the world where an ideology of (the desirability of) monolingualism has prevailed, mainly European and Europeanized countries. Old (Britain, France; Spain, etc.) and New World (USA) empires have often reacted and continue to react with patronizing harsh assimilation policies. Just as they were — and still are — busy with killing off indigenous languages (Australia and the US have killed off more languages during the last 200 years than any other countries in the world). These education systems make every effort to ensure that the new linguistic and cultural capital that has been injected into these countries in the form of immigrant minorities will disappear within three generations, and possibly sooner. Since Europe is the poorest part of the world in terms of native languages (see Appendix),...
now acknowledges that indigenous and other local people’s knowledge about their own environment is in many ways more detailed than that of (Western) scientists. And this is how ICSU (www.icusu.org) formulates the role of schools in this destruction in its 2002 report:

Universal education programs provide important tools for human development, but they may also compromise the transmission of indigenous language and knowledge. Inadvertently, they may contribute to the erosion of cultural diversity, a loss of social cohesion and the alienation and disorientation of youth. [..] In short, when indigenous children are taught in a science class that the most important thing ordered as scientists believe it functions, then the validity and authority of their parents’ and grandparents’ knowledge is denied. While their parents may possess an extensive and sophisticated understanding of the local environment, classroom instruction implicitly informs that science is the ultimate authority for interpreting ‘reality’ and by extension local indigenous knowledge is second rate and obsolete. [..] Actions are urgently needed to enhance the intergenerational transmission of local and indigenous knowledge. [...] ‘Traditional knowledge conservation therefore must pass through the pathways of conserving language (as language is an essential tool for culturally-appropriate encoding of knowledge).’ (ICSU, 2002)

Thread 2: Languages are equal, yet language hierarchies prevail

It is evident throughout this volume that not all language groups have equal chances of having their languages or language varieties included in schools. This mirrors the situation outside – speakers of certain languages in certain situations have more power than others, and the power is partially connected to the languages they know and do not know. Mostly, as Mohanty describes in the case of India, hierarchies are institutionalized through statutory process. The VIII Schedule in India identifies 22 constitutional languages and English as associate language, leaving most of the country’s hundreds of languages and languages are variable and flexible, responding to the context in which the language is studied. For example, as we saw in the example of the judge in Texas, ‘European’ languages do not hold the same value in different social contexts. In the United States, Spanish, which is an MFL in France, in most other European and some African countries, and in some North American countries, is also an RML in the US south west and some areas of the south and northeast. And certainly, Spanish is as an IML all over the United States.

One might imagine that the linguistic hierarchy follows numbers, and to some extent it does – the smaller the number of speakers, the less power and status the languages and their speakers have, and vice versa. But a look at
the list of the 21 languages with the highest number of speakers in the world (see Appendix) invalidates this hypothesis. In the Ethnologue’s 15th edition, English as a native language has surpassed not only by Chinese, but also by Hindi and Spanish. As we saw earlier, Zulu with its over 10 million speakers has less status (as the language of media, higher education, administration, etc.) than Icelandic with its under 300,000 speakers. If we use the criterion that an indigenous language has to be used as a medium of education, at least 99% of the world’s indigenous languages would be lower in the hierarchy than Anár Smi’s – it has fewer than 300 speakers; it has regional official status in Finland, and it is used as the main medium of teaching in primary school and in ‘language nests’, indigenous-medium day care centres, modelled after the Māori ‘kōhanga reo’, with elders who know the language and culture joining in and teaching parents, pre-school teachers (who are not always fully competent in the language) and the children.

The linguistic hierarchy also depends on the social distances constructed for languages. Faced today with the Structural Adjustment programs of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the policies of the World Bank, many autochthonous languages are blamed for the ill of the developing world. ‘Speaking of the indigenous peoples of Oaxaca, Mexico, Pardo (1993: 114) points out that ‘la presencia indígena... es vista como una de las causas del atraso y marginalización socioeconómica’ (‘indigenous presence... is assumed to be one of the causes of backwardness and socioeconomic inferiority’). Schools, even multilingual ones, are partially responsible for maintaining and reproducing those language hierarchies. Schools structure the symbolic violence within their policies and curriculum, making them one of the worst direct culprits in maintaining language and socioeconomic hierarchies (see also Magga et al., 2003; Torres-Guzmán, 2003; Dunbar et al., forthcoming). As already mentioned, language choices for educationalising programs, curricula and instructional materials are important mechanisms to establish these hierarchies. How the languages are reflected in the school and in the positions of those who speak them also establish language hierarchies. The language of school announcements used on official bulletin boards, in grade reports, and in communication with parents becomes more dominant than the one that is relegated to a ‘special’ classroom in which the second language is used. Often the language of instruction in the morning holds more prestige than the language of instruction in the afternoon, since children are purported to pay more attention during the first few hours of attendance. Who speaks the language in the school also helps establish language asymmetries (Amrein & Peña, 2000) and, thus, language hierarchy. If the principal speaks both languages, there is more equality between languages, than if only the service staff speaks the minority language. And if all students speak both languages, there is less power differential between the languages than if just the ethnominority

---

Weaving Spaces and (De)constructing Ways for Multilingual Schools

---

As shown by Sharp’s and Escamilla’s (1993) study, language and culture are deeply intertwined. The two languages are seen as complementary, not as competing. In their study, Sharp and Escamilla found that the children who were fluent in both languages were more successful in school, had higher self-esteem, and were more likely to persist in school. They also found that the children who were not fluent in both languages were more likely to drop out of school, had lower self-esteem, and were less likely to persist in school.

Recently, as more languages are present and evident in many Western schools, either formally or informally, schools have started to pay more attention to the language policies and practices that are in place. In this context, Sharp and Escamilla argue for a more integrated approach to language education, one that recognizes the value of both languages and cultures. They suggest that schools should provide opportunities for students to use both languages in their everyday activities, and that teachers should be trained to support the use of both languages in the classroom. They also argue for the development of bilingual education programs, which would provide students with the opportunity to develop proficiency in both languages and cultures.
or maintenance depends on the power relations between speakers of the languages in each context. It depends on linguistic hierarchies, rather than solely on the formal characteristics of the model. Most authors in this volume agree that transitional models are language-shift models and reproduce inequality, even if they give children a better chance than submersion programs. Our authors would obviously want the transition to come either late, or not at all (with the exception of a few subjects possibly being taught through the medium of the dominant language; and not even this is done in the Finland Swedish schools described earlier).

On the other hand, some multilingual schools establish language practices that affirm and privilege the non-dominant language. For example, López (Chapter 12) expresses the belief that the diglossic use of languages with unequal status where primacy is given to the indigenous language is the only way to stabilize and equalize languages. For López, intralingual use of indigenous languages, which propose to affirm and develop these languages while dealing with the existing asymmetries (Amrén & Pekä, 2000) is an important stage of development in order to equalize the two languages. Once equalized, a more multicultural stage can follow.

Sometimes the language practices of schools are based on turning the tables—affirming and privileging the non-dominant language, with the purpose of re-establishing the lost equilibrium between two or more languages. These multilingual schools separate the two languages strictly, and work on equalizing their power, by maximizing the role of the earlier dominated language. As described by Etxeberria in Chapter 5, Models B and C, half of the instruction is in Spanish, and half in Euskara; in Model D (which tends to get the best results in terms of bilingualism) instruction is in Euskara, and Spanish is taught as a subject. It is instructive to realize that in this kind of revitalization case, the model itself does not make it immersion or maintenance, but it is the way in which students experience it that makes it so. In Model D, Spanish-language students are immersed in Euskara. For Euskara-speaking students, however, Model D is simply instruction through the medium of their mother tongue. Language practices in schools cannot be divorced from student (and teacher) characteristics, history of oppression and the sociopolitical context of those who are immersed in those practices.

Mohanty (Chapter 13) makes a distinction between multilingual practices in three different types of Indian schools—informal, formal with a single medium of instruction, and formal with multiple languages as medium of instruction. Under the informal type, the lesson can be presented in one language and explained in another, usually the students’ mother tongue. The students can also interact with each other in their mother tongue while the whole classroom interaction is in another local mother tongue, but the teacher conducts the lesson in a more dominant language. Even if these may be more traditional teacher-centered classrooms, they show a great variety of multilingual practices. In the formal types of schools with a single medium of instruction, a dominant language (e.g. Hindi or a regional dominant language, or English) is the medium of instruction, while other languages are taught as subjects. Here too, from a student’s point of view, it is not a question of which language is used as a medium. The main question is whether it is or is not (one of) the student’s mother tongue(s). Or, stated in another way, what socio-historical and political relationship does this young person have with the language of instruction? Since the Indian states have been drawn and redrawn to follow linguistic lines as much as possible, there are smaller or larger minorities in every state, and for these, including 99% of the indigenous (‘tribal’) peoples, using a state’s majority language (for instance Oriya in Orissa, or Hindi in the northern Hindi-majority states) as the main medium of instruction, is still subversion, while for Oriya or Hindi speakers it is a maintenance program. The formal school types with multiple languages as media of instruction are true multilingual schools (more than two languages are used as media of instruction). They could be good representatives of the specifically Indian ‘three language formula’. They can support multilingualism if all languages are, through being used as media and taught as subjects, maintained throughout the students’ entire schooling years. But they can also, despite being multilingual schools, be early- or late-exit teacher training programs, if the earlier languages (which are more likely the mother tongues of at least some of the students) are dropped as media of instruction, and even as subjects. In the latter case, these multilingual schools can also be agents for later monolingual practices within the school setting. Again, language practices must be seen in their sociopolitical context, and from the point of view of the language of instruction whether they are present and in what capacity (medium, subject, informal interaction) for what length of time, and whether they can be thoroughly learned.

Thread 3: Hybridities in multilingual practices and in identities are old, yet awareness of them has increased

Even though language practices in schools often seem to be neatly sorted into different times, subjects, teachers, students, etc., there is evidence of much hybridity in the language practices themselves. The concept of hybridity is important in understanding the multiplicity of language practices today. The concept is inspired by the work of Bakhtin (1981) on the hybridity of the dialogue of languages, by Anzaldúa (1987) on the hybridity of being in the ‘borderlands,’ and by Bhabha (1994) on the hybridity of postcoloniality. Gutiérrez et al. (2001: 128) have said ‘hybrid language use is
more than simple code-switching as the alternation between two codes. It is more a systemic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process... The contributions in this book describe both language and literacy practices, as well as identities, that build on hybridity.

As Mohanty shows, it is precisely this hybridity of language practices that is responsible for the maintenance of the many languages of the Indian subcontinent. Sridhar (1996) posits that in 21st century multilingual societies languages are not compartmentalized in a diglossic situation, but rather they overlap, intersect, and interconnect. This fluidity in multilingual interaction often characterizes communication in indigenous communities, as López shows for Guatemala and Bolivia, and in highly multilingual contexts, as Nyati-Ramahobo describes for Botswana. Stokely (Chapter 8) reminds us: 'Immigrants and other groups continue to construct meanings in the most creative ways, holding multiple identities and using multiple varieties of languages, especially in the current era of a transnational world.' A fusion of languages, dialects, scripts, registers, and semiotic systems characterizes how people communicate today.

The increased variation in multimodal discourses that result from the new media has led to multiplicities of language and literacy practices. As political and economic alliances are shaped and technology advances, language and literacy practices and identities are variable and integrated. In the 21st century, with the increased variation in multimodal discourses that are result of new media, multilingual literacies are practiced, as Coste (2001) says, in an integrated fashion. García, Bartlett and Kleifgen (forthcoming) refer to a plurilingual approach that 'captures not only literacy continua with different interrelated axes, but also an emphasis on literacy practices in sociocultural contexts, the hybridity of literacy practices afforded by new technologies, and the increasing interrelationship of semiotic systems.' Very few schools are building on the variability, hybridity, and sense-making processes that characterize out-of-school multilingual practices today, especially as languages that had been previously relegated to private domains access public domains, including the Web. In Chapter 2, Cummins gives us a set of indications as to how these hybrid multilingual language and literacy practices are capable of weaving spaces for multilingual education, even in schools that do not formally use several languages as media of education. Cummins builds on the multiliteracies pedagogy of the New London Group – pedagogy that includes (1) situated, meaningful practice, (2) overt instruction to scaffold students’ progress, (3) critical framing, and focus on historical, cultural, sociopolitical and ideological roots of knowledge and social practice, and (4) transformed practice in other cultural sites. Cummins adapts this pedagogy for multilingual students, building on the multilingual practices that children and youth use outside and inside school, and proposing that technology be used as the amplifier to expand practices with languages and literacies in developing identity texts. In the school described by Cummins, young students of diverse linguistic background create stories in English and, as far as they are able, in other languages. These are translated with the help of older students, parents, and teachers into the mother tongues of the minority students. These multilingual stories are then published on the web, accompanied by images, spoken, musical, dramatic renderings or combinations in multimodal form. Awareness of the hybridities of identities in classrooms is certainly enhanced together with contrastive language awareness.

Recent scholarly work on language ideologies has made evident that identity is multidimensional and interrelated to its negotiation in different contexts (Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). Mohanty describes the multiplicity of linguistic identities in Indian and South Asian bilingualism, as well as the flexibility in the perception of languages and their boundaries. Multilingualism as a mother tongue may be the future. Even when multilingualism is a reality, the type of multilingualism will be determined by which languages are involved, and their location. In an information society, where reading and writing skills at a high level are essential for the socioeconomic mobility that many of today's ordinary multilinguals desire, an 'international' multilingual-postmodern-highly-formally-educated elite nomad can easily disclaim any specific mother tongue. The situation is altogether different for people with little formal education and mobility, who have learned several languages in the environment, but have never had an opportunity to learn to read or write any of them, let alone in a standardized form.

The chapters in this volume also make evident that different social contexts can prevent individuals from adopting certain identities (see Helle, 1982, 1995; Woolard, 1998). Etcheberri’s chapter studies how the different school models in the Basque Country have shaped different language attitudes and identities. And McCarty et al. make evident how micro and macro processes inside and outside school interact to produce different language attitudes, language ideologies, and language choices. For the many Spanish and Native American students quoted in the chapters by Etcheberri and McCarty et al., their languages are sometimes sites of discrimination. 'They just kind of feel dirty about the whole thing,' says one of the Native American students in McCarty et al. about their use of Native American languages. But languages are also often used as sites of resistance and solidarity (see Pavlenko & Blackledge, 2004). One of the students in Etcheberri’s study says: 'To speak Euskara well has made me feel Basque. And, yet, to speak Spanish has never really made me feel Spanish. If I speak Euskara, I feel Basque and I like that because it is our language'. In Chapter 12, López describes a sad situation:
Perhaps the most insidious obstacle to bilingual education is the situation of indigenous teachers who speak the same languages as their students but prefer to use Spanish due to ideological beliefs that the children will be left behind in Mexican society if they learn in their native languages.

Cummins posits that identity investment is a central component of learning, and that negotiation of identities is a primary determinant of whether students will engage cognitively. Cummins’ negotiation of identities is related to the authentic caring in schools that McCarty et al. speak about in educating indigenous peoples.

Canagarajah (2005) claims that the relationship between language and identity may be more relevant today than ever because national identities are becoming fragmented with the weakening of nation-states. An awareness of language as an important (rather than ‘contingent’) and in most cases not important or necessary — see May (2003, 141) — part of the identities of many, if not most, people may be enhanced with this weakening, when people are looking for their roots in an increasingly threatening global environment. The Language Awareness pedagogy that Helot and Young (Chapter 3) describe in the Didenheim school in Alsace is used in many European school contexts today to familiarize students with many different languages and to learn to value both them and the multilingual competence and identities of some of their peers — and themselves.

Helot and Young also describe the difference between the CIILI/EMILE pedagogy (Content and Language Integrated Learning) being promoted in Europe and the bilingual education awareness and action pedagogy of North America. Using another language as medium of instruction for one or two school subjects, CIILI/EMILE allows for integrated competencies in different languages where some dominate.

The popular education programs described by Ogulnick are, by necessity, bilingual and multilingual, since the programs are based on the linguistic and cultural reality and perspectives of poor and marginalized people. In creating the term ‘popular education’ Paulo Freire (1973b) referred to grassroots literacy programs designed to create conditions for transformation and empowerment of the poor, illiterate peasants in Brazil. Popular education programs always teach critical language awareness, i.e. the need to understand the ways in which languages are used to exclude and discriminate. Often this education leads to language activism (Fairclough, 1992). In Chapter 7, Ogulnick describes in particular, how language and social activism occurs through the use of Augusto Boal’s method of liberatory education, Theater of the Oppressed. Participants role play real-life incidents to reflect on their subjugated positions and to reverse them. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas used this pedagogy in the mid-1980s in Rinkaby, the Stockholm suburb that had the highest percentage of foreign nationals in Sweden. The participants were Finnish parents, some with six years of formal education. In the role play, one side represented the Swedish National Board of Education, the other side represented immigrant minority parents, and they discussed Christina Bret Paulson’s report to the Board, which was at that point used by the Board against parents’ demands for mother-tongue-medium education. Regardless of the extremely solid scientific arguments that the ‘parents’ used, the ‘Board’ dismissed their demands. Some of the participants spoke of their sudden discovery — when they played the Board, they didn’t even need to listen to the parents’ arguments, let alone analyse them. They had, as ‘the Board’, the power, and could do exactly what they wanted. Arguments posed by others did not count. And likewise, the ‘parent’ side described their feeling of total powerlessness at meeting this attitude. The deep impact this made on the participants’ critical (language) awareness encouraged them to more consciously change their strategies in real life.

Most of the chapters in this volume attest to the importance of community parental support and participation in constructing good multilingual schools. Edwards and Newcombe point out that in South Africa, the United States, and Wales, parents are the moving force behind the imagining of multilingual solutions. It is for that reason that the program that Edwards and Newcombe describe — Tuf — precisely targets parents to educate them about the advantages of their children’s bilingualism.

Good multilingual schools always need to include critical (language) awareness and action as an important component of the curriculum. Multilingual students and parents need to understand the ways in which languages are used in undemocratic ways to exclude and discriminate, and what their alternatives are. The hybridity that emerges from the multilingual students and parents ‘in between’ or ‘borderland’ experiences must be brought out into the open and acknowledged as different and important world views, and as an important pedagogical tool.

In conclusion, like many others, pointed out that attitudes, values and beliefs about language are always ideological, and involved in social systems of domination and subordination of different groups. Schools are, in their work of teaching the standard national languages, responsible for one of the most prevalent linguistic ideologies — constructing a unidirectional link between language and ethnicity. And so, language ideologies are also responsible for the closing of spaces for multilingual practices in schools. Language awareness and linguistic and social activism stemming from the position of borderlands will together create more spaces for a multilingualism that will contain the voices that have been silenced and will permit language minority communities to make visible their dreams of a better world.
Thread 4: Tensions between state-imposed homogenization and real-life multilingualism can occasion the closing or carving of spaces

When national policies start to support bilingual education, especially for formerly excluded groups, it is often because they are trying to make up for years of exclusion, racism and discrimination. In Guatemala and Bolivia (López), and in Wales (Edwards and Newcombe), it has been grassroots pressure that has yielded political concessions for language in education. And yet, the implementation of these policies often leaves much to be desired. For example, Ogulnick, speaking about Chiapas, says that 'the reality of public education for indigenous children in rural areas is far from the promises made in the San Andrés Accords.' Ogulnick quotes an educator who says:

They say that education is bilingual and bicultural, but it really isn't. Only a little. Most teachers don't speak the languages of the students, so they teach in Spanish. They don't teach the native languages. (personal communication, July 2004)

Edwards and Newcombe, and Hornberger, suggest that both bottom-up and top-down activity is necessary. Citing Chick and McKay (2001), who suggested in the case of South Africa that ideological space opened up by top-down policies contributed to new discourses in implementational spaces at the grassroots level, Hornberger concludes:

Ideological spaces can carve out implementational ones. I think that perhaps it is also possible that implementational spaces carved out from both bottom-up and top-down activity may reciprocally be a means for wedging open ideological spaces as they are being closed by top-down policies.

On the other hand, Hornberger also describes what she sees as the closing of ideological and implementational space for multilingual education in the US: "There is increasing tension between the ongoing homogenization (through the insistence on national curricula and testing, for instance; see our earlier discussion) and the heterogeneity that we find in today's schools (see García & Traugh, 2002). Sometimes, as Hornberger, McCarty et al., and Escamilla make evident about the situation in the United States, the result of this tension is that 'linguistically different' students are excluded, resulting in increasingly alarming rates of failure and push-out rates among these groups. As Hornberger also points out, in this closing, however, spaces can and are being found and opened for new ways of thinking and acting that are only testimony to the resilience of the populations that face such linguistic oppression.

The more fluid situation of 21st century technology, economy and politics, the multiplicity of languages, literacies and identities in the classrooms, and the increased interest in acquiring the languages of power and English in particular, puts multilingual schools and multilingual educational practices at the center of schooling today. In many contexts, there are strong forces which are trying to turn multilingualism into English plus (maybe, just a little bit of) one other language.

Thread 5: English, English, everywhere...

The unchecked, subtractive spread of English is responsible for much submersion education, push-out, and educational failure throughout the world. Parents demand access to English for their children because learning English is seen as gaining a resource that might lead to other social opportunities (Nical et al., 2004; Craig, 1996). Brah Kachru's metaphor in his The Alchemy of English (1986) is still all too valid (see also Pennycook, 1994, 1998; Phillipson, 1992, 2002, 2005; Phillipson & Skutnabb-Kangas, 1994, 1996, 1999). Mohanty echoes this: 'Over the post-independence years, English has become the single most important predictor of socio-economic mobility.' Cummins tells us: 'The general population in contexts as disparate as Hong Kong, India, South Africa, and throughout Europe, accurately sees English as associated with upward social and economic mobility and demands that schools assign top priority to the teaching of English.' McCarty quotes a Navajo student: 'English...that's always taken over...It's just kind of hard to have anything really of a Native thing going on.'

In parts of the world parents seem to be choosing English-medium education whenever it is available. But Hornberger quotes Neville Alexander's (2003) affirmation that South African parents are not choosing English, but rather they are choosing the 'superior resourcing and academic preparation offered by the English-medium schools.' In India, a decade ago, a colleague told a friend of a family, a Kannada-speaking parent - the choice was between the Kannada-medium school where there were a dozen textbooks for the whole class, and the English-medium school which, among other things, had two planes. And in many cases, though the tension is not as stark, and if parents knew how the hopes of other parent's children in English-medium education have been shattered, they might choose differently. The false either/or ideologies and the forces behind them are the main culprit.

In South Africa, Kathleen Heugh (2000) conducted a countrywide longitudinal statistical study of final exam results for 'Black' students in South Africa. The percentage of 'Black' students who passed their exams decreased every time the number of years spent learning through the medium of the mother tongue decreased. Despite the resource-wise really inferior and partly racist apartheid education, the students did better when more of the education was through the medium of their own languages.
rather than English or Afrikaans. Another African study, that of Edward Williams (1998) of 150 students in grades 1–7 in Zambia and Malawi, came up with similar results. Large numbers of Zambian pupils, who had had all their education in English, had little or no reading competence in two languages, Williams observed. On the other hand, in Malawi, the children were taught in local languages (mostly their mother tongues), during the first four years, while studying English as a subject; English became the medium only in grade 5. The Malawi children had slightly better test results even in the English language than the Zambian students. In addition, they knew how to read and write in their own languages. Williams (1998: 63–64) concluded: ‘there is a clear risk that the policy of using English as a vehicular language may contribute to stunting, rather than promoting, academic and cognitive growth. This, just like many of the other examples of submersion education, fits one of the United Nations genocide definitions of ‘causing serious mental harm to members of the group’.  

In Australia, Anne Lowell and Brian Devlin (1999) clearly demonstrated that after Aboriginal students had been taught mainly through the medium of English, ‘even by primary school, children often did not comprehend classroom instructions in English’. Communication breakdowns occurred frequently between Aboriginal children and their non-Aboriginal teachers, with the result that the extent of miscommunication severely inhibited the children’s education when English was the language of instruction and interaction.’ In their conclusion the authors state: ‘the use of a language instruction in which the children do not have sufficient competence is the greatest barrier to successful classroom learning for Aboriginal Children’ (Lowell & Devlin, 1999: 156).

Skutnabb-Kangas (2000) refers to English as a ‘killer language’. Languages are today being killed faster than ever before in human history, and English is today the world’s most important killer language, even if there are many other numerically large languages (see Appendix). Also many dominant official or national or regional languages, regardless of size, can and do function as killer languages (e.g. Oriya in relation to small indigenous languages in India; Hausa, Ibo and Yoruba in relation to the other 400 plus Nigerian languages; or Finnish in relation to Saami or Romany in Finland). As Skutnabb-Kangas has said: ‘If dominant languages are learned subtractively, at the expense of other smaller dominated languages, the dominant languages become killer languages. ‘Being’ a killer language is NOT a characteristic of any language. It is a relationship, a question of how a language functions in relation to other languages. Any language can become a killer language in relation to some other language. Besides, ‘languages’ do not kill each other. It is the power relations between the speakers of the languages that are the decisive factors behind the unequal relations between the languages, which then cause people from dominated groups to learn other languages subtractively, at the cost of their own. Obviously other languages should (and can) be learned additively, in addition to one’s own language(s), not instead of it or them (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2004).

If minority or dominated group parents knew that their children could, in maintenance programs, both maintain and develop their own language(s) AND learn the dominant (or a second) language (often English) at least as well and often better than in dominant-language-medium submission programs, most parents would obviously start demanding these kind of programs. Strong grassroots demands might also help steer resources to these additive programs, rather than to the often disastrous and in most cases genocidal submission programs.

If we want to be charitable, we might accept that the threat from the spread of subtractive English has functioned and is functioning as a bell of warning, waking up many groups to the weakened and endangered status of their languages. The presence of English in education may carve out spaces for regional and indigenous languages, previously pitted against the monolingualism of an educational system in the national language only. Mohanlal describes how it is precisely in order to fight the dominance of English that Indian policy makers have used the concept of diversification, attempting to make sure that there is a wide choice of languages available in the curriculum at all levels. In Europe, there are almost weekly conferences discussing the threat from English at all levels and in all quarters.

The spread of English has been facilitated by its initial virtual appropriation of new technologies in media, film, etc. But as Cummins here reminds us, new technologies also afford opportunities for less dominant languages to carve out virtual space.” In a few years time, English will no longer be the most widely-used language on the Web. Indigenous peoples are also actively demanding that their languages be developed for purposes of the information society so that they can be used for all aspects of Information and Communication Technology (ICT), including computer software, database portals, and every possible type of digitizing these languages. At the same time as there is linguistic colonization and self-colonization in education (Phillipson, 1992; Spring, 1998; see Kamani, 2005a, 2005b, and www.tesolislamia.org/language_policy.html for accounts of and discussions on some of the new forms this takes; for university level, see also topics at www.palmenia.helsinki.fi/congress/bilingual2005/program.asp), there is also a lot of resistance to subtractive language spread and endangering languages, all over the world and not only in education but also in the rest of society.

Conclusion: Between Dispossession, Anger and Hope

In a chapter called ‘Accumulation by dispossession’, David Harvey
It was then that I got my life’s greatest shock! I realized that ‘mother tongue’ had taken over my *ettngalela* [‘mother tongue’ in North Saami]. I realized in horror that I could no longer relate the most common and everyday matters in my own language! That was the first time since I grew up that I realized the negative sides of my becoming Swedish. I started to comprehend that the Swedish educational system had robbed me of something valuable, yes, perhaps the most valuable thing I had learned – my language. I could no longer talk to Father! This fact made me shiver. I became desperate, despondent. And then I became angry.  
(Marainen, 1988:183)

We hope that many other people become angry in this sense, angry at the dispossession that schools are involved in, and that this anger is then used to start not only demanding but finally implementing the multilingual imaginings that this book also describes, not only for the hitherto disposessed and already multilingual indigenous peoples and minorities and dominated groups, but also for those who do not know that monolingualism has disposessed them.

**Notes**

1. In the rest of the chapter, we use ‘minority’, to stand for ‘indigenous and minority’. The North American expression ‘linguistically diverse children’ is a positive replacement for degrading terms that make the children’s knowledge of their own languages invisible and / or characterize them negatively (LIP) or negatively (ELF) or positively (English learners) only in terms of the dominant language that they do not yet know fully. In addition, ‘linguistically diverse students’ are a non-entity in international law, whereas indigenous children and minority children have at least some rights.

2. We’re grateful to Cecelia Traugh for calling our attention to this positioning in the work of Horton and Greene.

3. Hereafter we refer to chapters in this volume only with the authors names, without a year. All other references also have a year.

4. The factors contributing to the Finnish success are, according to the Finnish National Board of Education:

   Equal opportunities for education irrespective of domicile, sex, economic situation or mother tongue; regional accessibility of education; education totally free of charge; comprehensive, non-selective basic education; supportive and flexible administration-centralised steering of the whole local implementation; interactive, co-operative way of working at all levels; idea of partnership; individual support for learning and welfare of pupils; development-oriented evaluation and pupil assessment – no testing; no ranking lists; highly qualified, autonomous teachers; socio-constructivist learning conception (http://www.oph.fi/english/page.asp?path=447,488,36263,36266). See also http://www.oph.fi/english/pageLast.asp?path=447,488,36263,36266; http://www.oph.fi/english/pageLast.asp?path=447,488,36263,36268.

5. All the quotes are from Martin 2000a or 2000b; these reports do not have page numbers, and the references are not given in full.
6. See also e.g. Hamel, 1994; Hamel, 1997; May, 1999; McCarty, 2005c; Maga et al., 2005; for some assessments of the situation.
7. The USA has, in Teresa McCarty's view (personal communication, August 2005) "really had a 'White USA' (like "White Australia") policy all along - just not formally acknowledged (or celebrated, historically, as in the case of Australia)." We thank Teresa for valuable comments on this chapter.
11. See Skutubble-Kangas (2000) and many of her publications listed or available through her home page (http://akura.nuc.dk/~tovesk/) on linguistic genocide in education.
13. Similar experiences are common. Teresa McCarty (personal communication, August 2005) "It reminds me of a statement by a Navajo elder whose son spoke Navajo, but whose grandchildren (through the son) spoke only English (their Navajo mother had been dispossessed of her mother tongue through mission schooling). 'I cannot communicate [with them]...I live in silence.' Yes, we should be outraged."

Appendix

The first Count column in Table 1.1 gives the number of living languages (with at least one first language speaker) that originate in the specified area. Each language is counted only once, under the area of its primary country. The second Count column gives the total number of people who use these languages as their first language, regardless of where in the world they may live. The total is somewhat less than the actual world population because the Ethnologue lacks population estimates for about 5% of the languages. The Percent columns give the share of the count for that area as a percentage of the total number listed at the bottom of the Count column. The Mean column gives the average number of speakers per language, while the Median column gives the middle value in the distribution of language populations (that is, half of the languages have more speakers than that number and half have that number or fewer). There is a huge disparity between the mean size of languages and the median size.

Table 1.2 summarizes the distribution of languages by size. The Count column gives the actual number of languages within the specified population range and the total number of first-language speakers of those languages. Where the language entry in Table 1.1 lists a range of values for the population, the midpoint of the range is used for this tabulation. The Percent columns give the share of the count for that population range as a percentage of the total number listed at the bottom of the Count column. Note that there are still a few hundred languages for which the Ethnologue (15th edition) does not have a population estimate; the calculation of the

| Table 1.1 Distribution of languages by area of origin |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|
| Area         | Living languages | Number of speakers |
| Count | % | Count | % | Mean | Median |
| Africa | 2,092 | 30.3 | 675,887,158 | 11.8 | 323,082 | 25,391 |
| Americas | 1,002 | 14.5 | 47,559,381 | 0.8 | 47,464 | 2,000 |
| Asia | 2,269 | 32.8 | 3,489,997,347 | 61.0 | 1,538,077 | 10,171 |
| Europe | 239 | 3.5 | 1,504,393,383 | 26.3 | 6,294,532 | 220,000 |
| Pacific | 1,310 | 19.0 | 6,124,341 | 0.1 | 4,675 | 800 |
| Totals | 6,912 | 100.0 | 5,723,861,210 | 100.0 | 828,105 | 7,000 |

Source: http://www.ethnologue.com/ethnolang_docs/distribution.asp?by=size

| Table 1.2 Distribution of languages by number of first-language speakers |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Population range | Living languages | Number of speakers |
| Count | % | Cumulative % | Count | % | Cumulative % |
| over 100 m | 8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 2,201,423,372 | 40.208 | 40.208 |
| 10-100 m | 75 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 2,246,597,929 | 39.250 | 79.457 |
| 100-1000 m | 265 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 825,687,046 | 14.425 | 93.882 |
| 1000-10000 m | 892 | 12.9 | 17.9 | 283,651,418 | 4.956 | 98.838 |
| 10000-100000 m | 1,779 | 25.7 | 43.7 | 58,442,338 | 1.021 | 99.859 |
| 1,000-10,000 | 1,967 | 28.5 | 72.1 | 7,594,224 | 0.133 | 99.992 |
| 100-1,000 | 1,071 | 15.9 | 87.6 | 457,022 | 0.089 | 99.999 |
| 10-100 | 344 | 5.0 | 92.6 | 13,163 | 0.0002 | 99.999 |
| 1-9 | 204 | 3.0 | 95.5 | 696 | 0.00001 | 100.000 |
| Unknown | 308 | 4.5 | 100.0 | |
| Total | 6,912 | 100.0 | 5,723,861,210 | 100.0 | |

Source: http://www.ethnologue.com/ethnolang_docs/distribution.asp?by-size
percentages for speakers is therefore not able to take those languages into account. The cumulative columns give the cumulative sum of the percentages going from top to bottom in the column.

Note that 347 (or approximately 5%) of the world’s languages have at least one million speakers and account for 94% of the world’s population. By contrast, the remaining 95% of languages are spoken by only 6% of the world’s people.

Table 1.3 contains, for purposes of comparison, some data about countries described in this book or mentioned in the introduction, from the website of the US Central Intelligence Agency (http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/pp.html) – accessed 9 Aug 2005. There are errors in some of the data, and we wanted all the data to come from the same source and have therefore not corrected the errors. The lack of data in certain columns is also telling. We have also ourselves left out several observations, especially in the column about ethnic groups, because they are less relevant for the issues in the book. The reader is encouraged to find information for other countries mentioned in the introduction that we haven’t included in this table.

**Note to Appendix**

L. The texts for Tables 1.1 and 1.2 are modified from the original Ethnologue texts. Table 1.2 uses the Ethnologue data but we have simplified some of the figures. For clarification on how figures were derived, please visit the Ethnologue site: http://www.ethnologue.com/ethno_docs/distribution.asp?by=size

### Table 1.3: Some basic data about some countries mentioned in this chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Ethnic groups</th>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Literacy %</th>
<th>GDP in $ per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>32,855</td>
<td>French origin 23%, Amerindian 2%</td>
<td>English 59.3%, French 23.2%, Other 17.5%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>5,223</td>
<td>Finnish xx, Swedish 3.7</td>
<td>Finnish xx, Swedish 5.6, Saami 0.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>Icelandic 94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>31,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,080,264</td>
<td></td>
<td>No figures, lots of errors</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>Maori 7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>4,503</td>
<td>Sami 20.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>2,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea*</td>
<td>5,545</td>
<td>71% (not correct), English spoken by 1-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>44,344</td>
<td>Zulu 23.8%, Xhosa 17.6%, Afrikaans 13.3%, Sepedi 9.4%, English 8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>9,097</td>
<td>No figures</td>
<td>No figures</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>295,734</td>
<td>White 61.7%</td>
<td>English 82.1%, Spanish 10.7%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>40,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>